

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 9, 14-18 and 21 were examined by the Office, and in the Office Action of September 15, 2008 all claims are rejected. With this response claims 1, 9, 14 and 21 are amended. All amendments are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. Support for the amendments can be found at least from page 4, lines 4-9 of the specification. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the following discussion.

This response is submitted along with a Petition to Revive for Unintentional Abandonment.

Claim Rejections Under § 103

In section 6, on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-2, 4-6, 9, 14-18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Theimer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,493,692) in view of Skladman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,181,495), and in further view of Nale (U.S. Appl. Publ. No. 2003/0074411). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 as amended is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, either alone or in combination. Claim 1 is amended to recite storing at least one filtered push type e-mail of the received push type e-mail in the mobile terminal device in a manner not visible to said selected user profile when the at least one filtered push type e-mail does not pass the filter characteristics. Applicant respectfully submits that at least this limitation is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Furthermore, applicant respectfully submits that the limitation of controlling at the mobile terminal device the handling of push type e-mails according to the selected user profile comprising enabling or disabling push type e-mail by activating or deactivating a hardware or software component required to receive push type e-mails in the mobile terminal device is also not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

Claim 1 is amended to recite that when at least one filtered push type e-mail does not pass the filter characteristics, the filtered push type e-mail is stored in the mobile terminal device in a manner that is not visible to the currently selected user profile. In contrast to claim 1, Theimer discloses evaluating a message and determining a display property which indicates how the message should be delivered, if at all. See

Theimer column 25, lines 27-29. For example, if the intended recipient has access to both a workstation and a Tab the message is delivered to the most appropriate device. See Theimer column 25, lines 33-36. If the evaluation determines that the message delivery is not appropriate, the application may wait for a change in context of the user before reattempting delivery. See Theimer column 25, lines 46-51. However, Theimer does not disclose storing at least one filtered push type e-mail in the mobile terminal device in a manner that is not visible to the selected user profile, instead Theimer at most only discloses not delivering a message at all if it is not appropriate. Therefore, Theimer at least fails to disclose or suggest this limitation of claim 1.

Furthermore, on page 6 of the Office Action the Office relies upon Nale to disclose disabling push type e-mail by deactivating a software component required to receive push type e-mail in the mobile terminal device. However, in contrast to claim 1 Nale only discloses holding mail received in a Database (608), and the Database is not a component in the mobile terminal device that receives the messages as received in claim 1. Instead, the Database (608) is located at a central office that receives regular mail, and scans the mail into electronic form which may then be emailed to users. The holding of mail while a user is on vacation does not correspond to the deactivating of a software component in the mobile terminal device, because the holding occurs at the central office and not with the user who will ultimately receive the forwarded electronic mail. Therefore, Nale also fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1.

Independent claims 9, 14, 19 and 21 contain limitations similar to those recited in claim 1, and therefore are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1.


The claims depending from the independent claims are also not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

Conclusion

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to Deposit Account No. 23-0442 any fee deficiency required to submit this paper.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 9 September 2009



Keith R. Obert
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 58,051

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER
SLUYS & ADOLPHSON LLP
Building Five, Bradford Green
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 00495